DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 707 CS 000 118

TITLE	Intensive Reading Instructional Teams (IRIT), 1971-1972.
INSTITUTION	Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE	12 Jul 72
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Decoding (Reading); Educational Accountability; Elementary Grades; *Individualized Reading; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Ability; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Teaching Procedures; *Team Teaching; Urban Education; Vocabulary Development; Word Recognition

ABSTRACT

Four Intensive Reading Instructional Teams (IRITs) consisting of a reading consultant, two master teachers, and a clerk typist provided intensive compensatory reading instruction for more than 500 Hartford third, fourth, and fifth grade students during the 1971-72 school year. The approach of the IRITs was geared to the concept of individualized learning and instruction, student self-direction, and program accountability. Groups of approximately 45 students spent mornings for a ten week period with the IRIT. The overall approach to disability correction involved three areas of concentration: decoding, vocabulary and comprehension development, and individualized reading. The measured achievement levels of children in the program, based upon pre and post group tests, increased significantly. Parent, teacher, and student surveys indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the program. The IRITs also served as an inservice teacher education team, providing instruction in individualized reading methodology and materials. Appendix includes organizational, content, and evaluative data. (TO)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 066707

IRIT
1971-1972

C&C

CHALLENGE FOR CHANGE

an evaluation report

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS·249 HIGH STREET·HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

ED 066707

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

IRIT

1971-1972

Evaluation Office
July 12, 1972

PREFACE

The narrative portions of this report were prepared from materials which were collected and submitted by Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood, Hartford's Assistant Supervisor of Reading and the IRIT coordinator.

Robert J. Nearine

July 12, 1972

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

IRIT

1971-1972

Overview

During its first seven years of continuous operations, Hartford's Intensive Reading Instructional Team program has continuously demonstrated that learning to read is not only fun, but that it can be highly productive as well. In consequence of these findings, a wide variety of accolades have supported the success of the program--and these came not only from Hartford parents and children, but from a wide spectrum of sources such as the U.S. Office of Education, as well. Mirrored in a number of national articles and press releases, truly, the fame of the IRIT program has rightfully spread across the nation.

Description

Funded for the first time as part of Hartford's Title I program, the three IRITs continued to provide intensive compensatory reading instruction to some 416 pupils in the validated schools of Hartford. In addition to the three ESEA teams, a fourth IRIT Center, funded under the General Budget, also provided team services to another group of 132 pupils attending three schools in non-target areas. Working in a joint effort, all four teams provided services to third, fourth, and some fifth grade students in an approach which was highly geared to the goals of Hartford's concept of individualized learning and instruction, student self-direction and program accountability.

The overall program design which was followed was a familiar one and one which had grown out of a number of previous successes. First of all, team personnel in each Center consisted of a reading consultant who was

also the team leader, two master teachers with strong backgrounds in reading, and a part-time clerk-typist. Next, the actual instruction took place in ten-week cycles, during which approximately 45 students from one school could be serviced. And finally, the overall approach to disability correction involved a three-pronged attack on reading. Here, each teacher specialized in one of three areas of concentration: decoding, vocabulary and comprehension development, and individualized reading.

The organization of each team was similar in nature, but with a few notable exceptions. All teams permitted the youngsters to move from teacher to teacher at approximately one hour intervals during each morning in the cycle. In the afternoon, youngsters continued to receive regular instruction in their other subjects given, of course, by the regular classroom teacher. While three of the four teams continued to serve several schools on a cycle-by-cycle basis, the newly-opened J. C. Clark School team worked only with youngsters from that one school and on an ungraded, multi-area instructional basis.

The three areas of instructional focus deserve some consideration.

1. Decoding and Word Attack Skills

   Here the skills of word analysis were emphasized so as to help each child develop his ability to better decode strange words which were encountered in reading. To do this, each student's reading status was carefully diagnosed so that instruction could be concentrated on the areas of weakness. Because this concentration was only possible through the individualization of instruction, a sequence for skill development was developed for each youngster which employed many different materials and approaches to the development of skill proficiency. Programmed readers, for example, were extremely useful for working with some children; others learned

best through the use of the Language Master; and still others children progressed through a series of tape-recorded lessons which provided the self-pacing tutor which a youngster needed to explain a particularly difficult lesson.

One of the more useful and, perhaps, most interesting methods was the employment of games in teaching. These games were created by IRIT teachers specifically to fulfill student skill needs in such a way that the need for continuous and monotonous drill could be avoided. Here, a test-teach-test routine was followed with careful records of individual progress kept on each and every student.

Because pupil records were so specific, direction for the accomplishment of all lessons could be given on an individual basis. So, too, could decoding materials be individually applied to this task. For example, some of the decoding materials which were used successfully included:

The B. R. L. and McGraw-Hill programmed texts

Stern's Structural Reading

Phonics Is Fun and the Phonics Workbooks

Dr. Selma Herr's Phonics

Listen and Do - Vowels and Consonants

Teacher-prepared phonics games, worksheets and transparencies

Durrell's - Speech-to-Print-Phonics

2. Vocabulary and Comprehension Development

In this program area, vocabulary development included emphasis on the recognition of new words encountered, the meanings of these words, and the correct usage of the words in sentences. Teacher-made materials, designed to increase the pupil's vocabulary, were used together with a

number of teaching techniques; these proceeded in logical sequence as each student's skill level developed.

Some of the comprehension skills which were emphasized included finding the main idea, locating answers and information, following directions, drawing conclusions, and ordering the sequence of ideas. Here again, a number of multi-level materials were utilized; of these, several were reported as being outstanding.

S. R. A.'s Individualized Lessons and the Comprehension Series

Durrell's Word Analysis Cards

Barnell Loft's Specific Skill Series

Reader's Digest Audio-Lessons

McGraw's Reading for Concepts

EDL Comprehension filmstrips

Teacher-prepared Language Master cards and comprehension exercises were used to fill in gaps in the foregoing commercial materials

3. Individualized Reading and Enrichment

An important goal of this area was to develop the students' appreciation and enjoyment of literature. From hundreds of color-coded books, students were able to choose the books that they actually wanted to read. This, in turn, led to oral language development, the interpretation of pictures in the books, and a further exposure to children's literature via the medium of films, records, and taped or teacher-read stories.

For each instructional cycle, a progress bulletin board was constructed and this was used to record each of the pupil's readings. These were also discussed with the teacher during a regular series of conferences and were used as a basis for widening the selection of stories which were read so

that the child's field of knowledge and his interest in literature could be expanded.

Creative writing was also encouraged in the area of literature and comprehension. This was supplemented by comprehension checks which had been developed by the teachers. Scholastic Kits, the Random House Individualized Programs, and records and filmstrips were some of the other materials which were used in this part of the program.

SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

As a supplement to the formal evaluation proper, several successful outcomes were reported by the program coordinator.

1. Many changes in pupil attitudes were apparent at the end of each ten-week school cycle. Written comments from the parents, the teachers, and the children included many positive reactions to the program.
2. Two national magazines, the May 1972 issue of American Education and the February 1972 edition of Reading Newsreport published articles featuring Hartford's IRIT program.
3. IRIT personnel were invited by the Hartford-International Reading Association and the Connecticut Association for Reading Research to explain the operation of the IRIT program and to display its materials.
4. The movement of two teams to "in-house" locations provided for continued contact with the children. This placement also permitted these teams to give assistance to other teachers and to hold seminars on individualized reading techniques, materials, and equipment.
5. Opportunities were provided for student teachers from one school to observe teaching techniques by viewing an IRIT in action.

6. Open houses offered several opportunities for parents, teachers, and administrators to communicate with each other as they visited the IRIT in progress. That all aspects of these visits were favorably received could be demonstrated by the fact that fully 44% of the parents visited one or more of the Centers.

7. Closing exercises formed an important part of each program. At that time, students demonstrated their reading abilities to their parents and received, in turn, reading certificates for these achievements. This was a highlight of each cycle.

8. A city-wide reading conference was held at one school, with teams sharing responsibility for demonstrating and presenting materials to other teachers. During the afternoon of the conference day, a materials workshop was held for teachers where games and other materials which could be used in the classrooms were actually constructed.

9. A fourth team held a staff workshop in their school. Evaluations made by the teachers stated that the workshop was very helpful and should in the future be repeated.

10. As a motivational device, achievement skill charts were displayed. As skills were mastered, students crossed these off against their recorded needs. This technique, too, proved to be highly effective.

11. There were regular communications established between IRIT teachers and their sending classrooms. In some of the Centers, regular meetings were held and in other Centers, written reports were used as the communications. In the latter instance, reports went to the teachers on a regular basis and served to document each pupil's progress.

12. Many individual success stories could be reported but one oustanding example of success is cited. A fifth grade girl who was an internal stutterer, was totally unable to speak or read freely and this problem severely affected both her silent and oral reading. Because the informal atmosphere in one Center was conducive to a lack of tension, with tutoring by three experienced teachers, the child gradually improved her oral reading skill to the point that at the end of the ten-week cycle she was able to stand with others and read with a fluency which was equal to the group as a whole. Both the child's mother and the principal expressed amazement since this was the first time that either had heard the child read publicly.

PROBLEM AREAS

While not specifically reported as problems, several recommendations were made by the coordinator.

1. A full-time secretary for the IRIT coordinator is needed for the proper conduct of the program.
2. Increased secretarial service for each IRIT Center would permit more service to be given to the children and teachers and would provide for more contact with parents.
3. The IRIT has been successful in Hartford. Thus, the program should be expanded so as to provide each elementary school with IRIT service.
4. Using the IRIT Centers as teacher-training units is recommended as a way of training new and inexperienced teachers in the latest reading techniques and materials.
5. Weekly scheduled meetings between parents and IRIT teachers is

suggested. Here, a specific group of parents should be invited by each team one afternoon each week to discuss the program and their children's progress.

EVALUATION

Once again, a number of tests and nontest techniques were employed in the product assessment of the program. That these techniques were continued was in recognition of several important considerations. First of all, the evaluation recognized that because the IRIT was an individually prescribed instructional program which had to be based upon the diagnoses of specific skill deficiencies, it was obvious that a number of diagnostic instruments would be used in conjunction with the instruction. These would include both standardized and teacher-made instruments as well.

Secondly, a number of more general instruments would have to be used for overall program evaluation. These had to be selected to provide continuity of data and to insure that resultant information could be applied to other reading programs as well. And finally, a number of unobtrusive indicators should be utilized in an attempt to bring some humanism into the evaluation of the program.

The selection and utilization of the three kinds of evaluative techniques created a number of problems. Since the IRIT program was oriented around a series of specific objectives, yet was individualistic in nature, it was difficult to summarize the various specific diagnostic data which were collected in many ways from the youngsters. This problem was resolved by having team leaders report objective accomplishments on a team-to-team basis. That these data could be collected so efficiently was, in the view of the evaluator, a tribute to the management of the program.

Next, it was recognized that the use of group achievement measures would provide little or no information about the specific objectives which were stated in the funding proposal. At the same time, program personnel recognized the fact that the IRIT had to be evaluated in terms of general reading achievement. Thus, the collection of group data was necessary since the program would probably be compared with other reading programs in the city. Here, of course, was the trade-off; standardized group achievement measures rather than team-developed criterion referenced items.

Lastly, while a great deal of subjective information was reported, the lack of clerical assistance provided the coordinator meant that the filtering out of much more data was required. Consequently, questionnaire responses from teachers, parents, and youngsters had to be reported on only a one-cycle basis. While these were probably typical of response patterns covering the program as a whole, the added kinds of informational input which might otherwise have been tallied could have had input into the program as a whole. How responsive the IRIT can remain toward any indicators for change remains to be seen.

Specifically, the formal evaluation attempted to look at several facets of the program. Note here that the various analyses were obtained for the overall program, on a center-by-center basis, and by sex, and in all possible combinations. Note also that here an evaluative emphasis was placed upon on general consideration: as the result of their IRIT services, did the youngsters appear to be reading better than they had been reading before? This, after all, was the overall intent of the program.

1. Because the IRIT program had focused during the 1971-72 school year on youngsters at the grade 3 through 5 levels, it seemed logical that one testing program should be utilized. This was in contrast with the prevailing

situation whereby group measures of achievement had been selected on the basis of school testing patterns, with the result being that comparisons between all teams was virtually impossible. Because plans had been made to test all third graders in the city with the reading portions of the California Achievement Test (sometimes called the California Reading Test), both pre and post, it was decided that this instrument would also be utilized on a pre- and post-cycle basis with all IRIT Centers. Consequently, the CAT, which produced vocabulary, reading comprehension, and total reading scores, was administered to 540 children over the course of the program. Of the youngsters tested, both pre- and post-test data were obtained from 520 children; a number representing fully 96% of the whole.

2. When CAT data were compared on a pre-post program basis, vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading score average gains were significant at the .01 level. That is to say, the probability that these gains were merely due to chance was only 1 out of 100. Specific program gain differences are reported as follows:

Subscore	Pre Test G.E.	Post Test G.E.	Difference
Vocabulary	2.8	3.3	.5**
Comprehension	2.5	3.3	.8**
Total Reading	2.7	3.3	.6**

** p .01

3. As could be expected, the pre and post gain differences which were collected from each of the four IRIT centers were also significant at the .01 level on the CAT subscores of vocabulary, comprehension, and reading. In this, there were no exceptions to the pattern. Specific gain scores, by IRIT center and subtest, are reported as follows:

Team	Vocabulary Pre GE	Vocabulary Post GE	Vocabulary Dif. GE	Comprehension Pre GE	Comprehension Post GE	Comprehension Dif. GE	Total Reading Pre GE	Total Reading Post GE	Total Reading Dif. GE
Harris	3.3	3.9	.6**	3.0	3.7	.7**	3.2	3.9	.7**
Jones	2.4	2.8	.4**	2.0	3.0	1.0**	2.3	2.9	.6**
Wish	2.7	3.0	.3**	2.5	3.1	.6**	2.6	3.1	.5**
Clark	2.8	3.4	.6**	2.6	3.4	.8**	2.7	3.4	.7**

** p .01

4. When the same CAT scores were further analyzed to determine if the basis for gains was because one sex did far better than the other, here again all gains were significant at the .01 level. Gain scores in grade equivalents, by team, and by sex, are reported as follows:

Team and Sex	Vocabulary Pre GE	Vocabulary Post GE	Vocabulary Dif. GE	Comprehension Pre GE	Comprehension Post GE	Comprehension Dif. GE	Total Reading Pre GE	Total Reading Post GE	Total Reading Dif. GE
Harris									
Boys	3.3	4.0	.7**	3.0	3.7	.7**	3.2	3.9	.7**
Girls	3.2	3.8	.6**	2.9	3.6	.7**	3.1	3.8	.7**
Jones									
Boys	2.2	2.6	.4**	1.8	2.8	1.0**	2.1	2.7	.6**
Girls	2.5	3.1	.6**	2.2	3.1	.9**	2.4	3.1	.7**
Wish									
Boys	2.6	2.8	.2**	2.4	2.8	.5**	2.5	2.9	.4**
Girls	2.8	3.1	.3**	2.6	3.3	.7**	2.7	3.2	.5**
Clark									
Boys	2.8	3.4	.6**	2.7	3.3	.6**	2.8	3.4	.6**
Girls	2.7	3.4	.7**	2.6	3.4	.8**	2.7	3.4	.7**

**p .01

5. Where the overall pattern of gains was so highly significant, and at the .01 level, an obvious question arose in terms of specific team data. This was the question of differences between the teams at large. To obtain this information, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. Here, the teams were compared, one with each other, on each of the three reading subtests to determine whether significant differences did exist. This was not done in an attempt to show whether one team was better

than another; in the light of the gains which were produced by each of the teams, this kind of comparison could be highly falacious. Instead, the analysis simply looked at the various teams so as to say if the IRIT

6. program seemed to be operating at about the same overall level. Here, differences, significant at the .01 level, could be reported. Note that the test score which was significantly different (.01) was plotted in terms of school intersections. Note also that no indication as to which scores were "better" was given.

	Harris	Jones	Wish	Clark
Harris	-----	CR		
Jones		----	V	V
Wish	VCR	CR	----	V
Clark	CR	CR	C	----

V = Vocabulary
C = Comprehension
R = Total Reading

7. In terms of the specific program objectives, here the stated levels of attainment were reached and frequently exceeded on both a program and on individual team basis. These data, as reported by team leaders, are contained in the Appendix.

8. While the highly salutary nature of the various test data continued to attest to the fact that IRIT youngsters were reading much better at the end of their instructional cycle, the program administration recognized that the test results taken by themselves are often deceiving. Rote learning without comprehension could have taken place. Consequently, an attempt was made to determine how the parents, youngsters, and teachers really felt about the IRIT program. Note here that tabular data cover the

IRIT program as a whole, while the comments have been extracted only from Cycle 1 of the program. While this extraction represented an economy of labor, it should be noted that the cited comments are typical of those received by the program as a whole.

A. Parent Evaluations of the IRIT Program:

1) As a parent, did your child enjoy attending the Reading Program?

Much	- 221	- 88%
Some	- 25	- 10%
Not at all	- 5	- 2%

2) What did your child like about the reading school?

Everything. Wish he could keep going. Feeling is he can read better.

The whole staff. The program.

Working in such a relaxed manner with all the new equipment.

Everything.

The typing phase

Taped lessons, typewriter, concentration games.

D_____ liked using the special books offered.

She likes to read the books.

Liked the reading and the games especially.

3) What did your child dislike about the reading school?

She never complained of anything.

Nothing.

D_____ did not care for the Language Master machine.

He didn't like riding on the bus.

4) How had your child's attitude toward reading changed?

Enjoyed to read a little more than he had been reading in

the past.

She always loved reading.

She now makes a good effort to read books at home she would never read before.

I find that she picks up more books and newspapers.

Attitude not changed, like to read before entered program.

Enjoys reading more now, is able to comprehend the story.

She likes to read but tends to stick to books with fewer words. Easier books.

He enjoys it better because he has learned how to sound out the words himself.

5) How has the reading program affected your child's attitude toward school in general?

She has been able to tell the story after reading the book. And also concentrate reading.

She says now she will do better in her work because she can read a little better.

I have no trouble in her going to school now which I had before.

Enjoys going to school more.

Did not affect other classes.

Yes - for the better.

She is now against the regimentation of normal class work.

She always liked school. Her attitude is still the same. It hasn't changed.

Her grades have improved, and I believe the reading program has definitely helped.

No. He still doesn't like to go to school.

6) Did you visit the Reading Program?

Yes	- 85	- 36%
No	- 142	- 61%
No answer	- 7	- 3%

7) Did you help your child with the newspaper?

Yes, but she also reads on her own now.

Was not told about this newspaper.

Yes	-	104	- 50%
No	-	87	- 42%
No answer	-	16	- 8%

8) How would you suggest that the reading program be improved?

To my knowledge, it's fine the way it is. Thank you all very much for the fine work you have done with the children.

To have the program continue in our own classrooms if at all possible, so that other children may enjoy reading.

Only to say that they should have it in <u>every</u> school so that more children could be helped, in the early stages of school which is so important.

By making it available to all children.

More work using manipulative skills toward reading.

I see no reason to make any suggestions because we think you are making a good program.

I'm in no position to suggest any changes. I only visited there once. One suggestion - that the fresh bigger boys on the bus be dealt with more severely.

It would be nice if there could be more of them so every school could benefit from them <u>each</u> year and not just once every 3 or 4 years.

B. <u>Typical Teacher Evaluation Responses Included</u>:

1) What changes have you noticed in the skills of the children attending the IRIT? Describe briefly.

Pupils are skilled in the use of the A.V. equipment.

Better ability to follow directions, listening with greater understanding.

Unable to evaluate specific skills

Independent approach to attacking new work.

A definite improvement in attacking new words, oral reading, and comprehension.

Increase in word-attack skills.

The children seem to be more open in producing work at their own levels.

2) What changes in the children's attitude toward reading did you notice? Describe briefly.

Pupils are more aware of decoding in order to comprehend the written word.

No change!

They all expressed enjoyment with the program and were pleased to share experiences with their classmates.

A greater interest in reading comprehension.

Greater interest in "books," i.e., stories, reading, hearing, telling.

They were quite proud of their achievements (books read).

The children appear to be more interested in reading than earlier in the year. They exhibit more courage in trying to read.

None to speak of - because I have no formalized reading in the afternoon. Eagerness to take home school library books is evident.

The above-named child plainly enjoys reading much more than he did before the program began. He has asked to read to the class.

The children are more enthusiastic about the library and books they have discovered there.

3) What changes have you noticed in your pupil's attention span in other subject areas?

Pupils respond to the Multi-instructional approach which allows for concentrations at varied lengths of time according to the individual child.

Increased learning self-motivation!

One pupil showed noticeable improvement. Span of others not measurably different, but interest was generally quite good.

None.

No appreciable change.

Seems to be the same.

No noticeable changes.

Both A_____ and D_____ have improved in their attention and interest.

To some degree, a morning of intensive reading tires children. We have found this same thing true with the reading program at ___X___ school.

4) What behavioral changes have you noticed? Please specify.

Pupils are much more mature in their approach to learning and problem solving in word attack skills.

None!

Definite enjoyment of program as mentioned in 2 above. Attendance was very good.

Want to do and complete work, able to work independent.

They seem to have adopted a more serious attitude towards learning and doing their work well.

Behavior of the children has remained basically the same.

A_____ is better able to follow directions - quietly - without asking for more help two or three times.

None.

There were no behavioral changes noticed.

5) Were you able to visit the IRIT Program to see it in action?

Yes - 10
No - 0

6) How many pupils remained with <u>you</u> during the a.m.?

2 teachers - 14 1 teacher - 22 1 teacher - 13 1 teacher -19
2 teachers - 15 1 teacher - 18 1 teacher - 16

7) What effect did removing some pupils from your classroom have on your program?

Program became more effective, enabled the development of greater individualization!

More individual attention led to greater growth in reading.

It helped in being able to know those who were left in the room better and give more individual help.

It was a great help in getting to know and ascertain needs of children left in room.

Helped immensely! I could concentrate on the lower readers.

8) How would you improve the IRIT Program? Describe briefly.

Try to encourage creative development for writing for self-expression.

Could not! Well run and coordinated.

The enthusiasm and efforts of the IRIT staff were definitely helpful to the pupils and to me as a teacher. Would explore ways of using program personnel - and activities at the individual school to develop an on-going program. Follow-up discussions will provide more answers to this question.

Enlarge it to include the very slow readers; even if their progress wouldn't be as great as the others.

Increase the number of units serving Hartford schools; concentrating in the 2nd and 3rd grades.

More programs like this is my only improvement.

9) How did the pupil progress reports help you?

It helped to determine follow-up and to identify specific strengths and weaknesses.

Kept me acquainted with their progress; thus enabling me to place them into my program more effectively!

Sharing of activity sheets was definitely informative and helpful. Report card grades gave useful information.

The reports helped us to understand the children's problems and how the reading team help to meet their needs.

Kept me well informed of the children's progress and what still needed working on so I could supplement in the classroom. P.S. I'm quite pleased with the program!

Informative in that they pointed out specific weaknesses and strengths of individual children.

It was informative to follow the direction of the work IRIT teachers were taking, and they were helpful in marking Report Cards.

They kept me informed of what was going on.

I always get ideas from the weekly folders. The children also enjoy seeing their own words typed for the "newspaper."

C. Student Evaluations:

The following percentages of responses are reported; these were based upon the 43 which were tallied.

1) Are you a boy or a girl?

Boy - 70%
Girl - 30%

2) What grade are you in?

3rd grade - 49%
4th grade - 33%
5th grade - 19%

3) Did you like changing classes?

Very much - 81%
Some - 9%
Not at all - 7%
Don't know - 3%

4) Did you like having three teachers?

Very much - 81%
Some - 9%
Not at all - 5%
Don't know - 5%

5) Do you feel the reading school has helped your reading?

Very much - 86%
Some - 9%
Not at all - 2%
Don't know - 3%

6) How hard was the work in reading school for you?

Too hard - 0
About right - 67%
Too easy - 30%
Don't know - 3%

7) Are your parents happy with the work you did in this school?

Very much - 88%
Some - 7%
Not at all - 0
Don't know - 5%

8) Do you want to go to reading school again?

Yes - 70%
No - 23%
Don't know - 7%

SUMMARY

For the seventh continuous year, Hartford's Intensive Reading Instructional Team program has again demonstrated that city youngsters can be taught to read so that their measured achievement levels are significantly better, a finding based upon group tests which were administered on a pre and post basis. There were also a number of other evidences of success which could be submitted; parent, teacher, and pupil surveys all indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the program. Not only that, but these indicated that the program could be fun as well.

"It Works" was the name of a USOE effort to select exemplary programs in education. The IRIT was one of those programs which were selected. Not only was the IRIT selected, but "It Works" it seemed was synonymous with the overall program; for seven consecutive years, it has proven to the citizens of Hartford that the IRIT works. What more could be said about the success of this compensatory program?

APPENDIX

WRITING AND EVALUATION

Appendix

CHECK LIST

I. PROJECT TITLE - I.R.I.T. COORDINATOR - M. BEATRICE WOOD, ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR OF READING

II. OBJECTIVES	Conditions	Task	Standards	Measurable
1.	After I.R.I.T. instruction	75% of the pupils will show a growth in vocabulary and comprehension skills	as evidenced in a month's gain in reading achievement for a month of I.R.I.T. instruction	Yes
2.	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	increase his independent reading by	reading two more books each month during the period of instruction	Yes
3.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all short and long vowels	with an accuracy of 70%	Yes
4.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all consonant letters presented	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
5.	I.R.I.T. pupils will be able to	identify rhyming words	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
6.	The pupils will be able to	answer comprehension questions at their level	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
7.	The pupil will be able to	read orally with reasonable fluency	at his level of attainment with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
8.	The pupil will	read a good variety of reading materials	in at least 3 different areas	Yes
9.	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	show gains in vocabulary development	for at least 75% of the pupils	Yes

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION

Objective to be Measured (Number)	Instrument and/or Method (How?)	Information Collected (What?)	Collection Schedule (When?)	Analyses (How Used?)	Expected Conclusion (What do You Expect to Show?)
1.	California Reading Test	Pupil Achievement in Reading	At the beginning and end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Growth in reading
2.	List of books read	The number of books read by each pupil	Monthly and at the end of each cycle	To promote the joy of reading	Increased number of books read
3.	Botel Phonics Inventory	Knowledge of consonant sounds	At end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in knowledge
4.	Teacher-made Test	Knowledge of sound symbol relationship	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in work attack skills
5.	Botel Phonics Inventory and	Ability to identify rhyming	At the end of each cycle	To identify skills needs	Mastery of rhyming words
6.	Teacher-made Tests	Degree of comprehension skills	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in comprehension
7.	Informal Reading Inventory	Oral reading fluency	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Improved oral fluency
8.	List of books read	Tastes in reading materials	At the end of each cycle	To provide a wide exposure to pupils	Improved and varied tastes
9.	Teacher-made Tests	Vocabulary knowledge	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Growth in

IV. COORDINATING REQUIREMENTS

Who will do What?	When?
Testing	
The Lower Primary, Upper Primary or the Elementary - California Reading Test will be administered Forms W and X.	At the beginning and end of each cycle of pupils
Botel Phonics Inventory - Forms A, B	At the beginning and and end of each cycle
Teacher-made Tests and Inventories	As needed by pupils
Development and the Selection of Instruments	
The selection of the test form will depend on the levels of the pupils	
24 **Analysis of Data**	
Mr. Robert Nearine	June
Development for Final Report	
M. Beatrice Wood	June

REPORT TO TEACHERS

June 2, 1972

Dear

The time is growing shorter and we still have much we would like to accomplish before school ends. Your help in getting the children to try to make the bus on time would be greatly appreciated. The attendance at the beginning of the cycle was excellent. Perhaps together, we can get it right back up again.

Sincerely,

F. O. Jones IRIT

Decoding Area

Period I

These children are making good progress and all are doing exercises using long vowels to unlock words even though their individual level may not be at that stage of development.

	Skills
1. L. _____ - BRL 8 2. E. _____ - BRL 7 3. W. _____ - BRL 6 4. V. _____ - BRL 6	1. long vowels made by adding silent "e" or by two like vowels coming together 2. long vowels when 2 different ones come together 3. soft "c" and "g" 4. "ew, aw, ou, oy, ow"
1. R. _____ - BRL 5 2. F. _____ - BRL 5 3. K. _____ - BRL 5	1. vowels controlled by "r" 2. "oll" pattern - stroll 3. long "o" in "fold"
1. G. _____ - BRL 4 2. M. _____ - BRL 4 3. Z. _____ - BRL 4 4. M. _____ - BRL 4 (absent)	1. three letter consonant clusters 2. plurals of 4 letter nouns 3. "o" in "dog" 4. "ff" and "ss" endings
1. T. _____ - BRL 2 2. I. _____ - BRL 1 & 2	1. blending short vowels and consonants 2. using initial consonant blends in unlocking

Period II

1. K. _____ - BRL 7 2. S. _____ - BRL 7 3. T. _____ - BRL 7	1. long vowels using silent "e" 2. "oo" as in "zoo" 3. soft "g" followed by silent "e" 4. long "i" in words like "mind"
1. D. _____ - BRL 6 2. R. _____ - BRL 6 3. A. _____ - BRL 6	5. "ow, ew, ow" 6. "ue" - Sue 7. "wh" in "why, when, which"

Decoding Area (continued)

Period II		Skills
1. E. _____	- BRL 5	1. long vowels
2. L. _____	- BRL 5	2. "all, ull, ush", patterns
3. A. _____	- BRL 5	3. "oy, ay, ou, ow"
4. D. _____	- BRL 5	4. vowels controlled by "r"
5. L. _____	- BRL 5	5. "live" rhyming with "five"
6. S. _____	- BRL 5	
7. G. _____	- BRL 5	
1. D. _____	- BRL 4	1. 3 letter consonant clusters
2. T. _____	- BRL 4	2. long vowels
		3. vowels controlled
		4. "ry, ng, rch, rp, rf" endings

Period III		
1. T. _____	- BRL 6	1. long vowel sounds
2. S. _____	- BRL 6	2. short vowels reviewed in unlocking situation
3. M. _____	- BRL 6	
4. O. _____	- BRL 5	3. "aw, ew, ou, oy, ow"
5. V. _____	- BRL 5	4. vowels controlled by "r"
6. D. _____	- BRL 5	5. "all, alt, ald" patterns
7. W. _____	- BRL 5	6. "ar" in "war"
1. S. _____	- BRL 4	1. vowels controlled by "r"
2. E. _____	- BRL 4	2. "rp, rch, rf, rn, rt" endings
3. A. _____	- BRL 4	3. long vowels (auditory)
		4. three letter blends

T. _____ is working in McGraw Book 3. Her attendance is very poor and that probably accounts for poor reading progress in the past. She seems to have good ability and with daily attendance could probably progress very nicely.

G. _____ is using both a BRL Book I and a McGraw Book 2. His progress is very slow but he is willing to try. K. _____ is working with G. in many activities, although his growth is not rapid, his effort has improved markedly.

Enrichment and Individualized Reading Area

Multi-syllable words that students had difficulty with when they were met in their individualized reading were reviewed and a simple sentence recalling the particular story was composed for each: i.e. - princess - "Cinderella became a princess."

Ditto sheets stressing following written directions, comprehension checks on brief stories, and pairs of opposites were also used during these two weeks. Read, Study, Think booklets (pages 11 through 15) also checked comprehension of written material.

In one particular group of slower readers, two read-alongs were used for fluency and oral expression: "Sandy the Swallow" and "Squeaky the Squirrel."

Filmstrip stories viewed and discussed were "Chicken in the Rough," "A Ducky Decision," "The Ant and the Grasshopper," "Pluto's Fledgling," and "Donald's Apple Orchard."

Records available these weeks were "The Wonderful Wizard of Oz," "Ghost Stories," "Cinderella," and "Yertle the Turtle." F. _____ brought in his library book, "Horton Hatches the Egg," to enjoy with the record which he noticed we have in our library.

Cassette stories available during this time were teacher-made recordings of "Pinocchio," "Curious George Gets A Job," and "Bessy, The Messy Penguin."

At least 35 minutes each period is now devoted to individual conferences and the children are really going through reading selections each time. It is seldom a child has only one book on which to report - usually he has two or three for each scheduled conference.

Vocabulary Development and Comprehension

SRA Reading Program:

Level A - The children who have been working in Level A of SRA have completed the book and corresponding workbook. Much time has been spent reviewing the short "a" and "i" word patterns. Other skills worked on include the following:

1. initial consonant substitution for rhyming patterned words
2. completing sentences correctly
3. matching words, phrases and sentences to the correct picture
4. introduction of short e, u and o vowel sounds encountered in Level B. stressing t in its final position
5. answering simple comprehension questions
6. meanings of all words presented

Level B - A. _____, E. _____ and T. _____ have completed this level and have just begun working in Level C. Skills worked on include:

1. patterned words with x in its final position
2. review of all patterned words in Level B
3. answering comprehension questions on their level
4. in Level C, words ending in ll, ss, ff, zz, nn
5. identifying characters and animals in stories
6. writing down a patterned word after being given its meaning

Level C - The children working on this level have one more story before completing the book. Skills include:

1. review of l and r blends
2. s, r, and l blend words ending in ff (cliff), ll (smell), ss (class), and ck (brick)
3. comprehension questions on their level
4. writing original sentences to go with particular pictures cut from the corresponding workbook
5. sequence of events
6. meanings of all words presented
7. completing words with correct short vowel, and sentences with correct work

Level E - These children have been concentrating on words containing the long vowel sounds - words ending in silent e (skate, hide, rule). Other skills include:

1. numbering events in sequential order
2. identifying characters
3. answering comprehension questions on stories read
4. distinguishing between sentences
5. completing sentences correctly, when the first part of the sentence has been stated
6. identifying true statements
7. selecting the correct title for a particular story
8. adding ing to words ending in silent e

Level G - E. _____, V. _____, W. _____ and L. _____ have completed through page 194 in the textbook, and worked along in the corresponding workbook. They have enjoyed the stories, particularly the story entitled "A Concert for the Emperor." The reading of this story led to many questions on Mozart, and for more information, the children used a child's encylopedia for additional facts about Mozart. Other skills included:

1. words with more than one meaning. Such words as board, part, round, pick, suit and finish. From a given word box the children completed sentences using only those words.
2. writing answers to comprehension questions independently at their seats
3. making up original questions to ask in the group
4. making up an original story
5. matching the correct synonym to a given word
6. recognizing similarities in sentences
7. finding the correct ending to a particular story - "What Happened Next"

The children in the Bank Street program have continued to progress both in the content area, and in basic skills.

Green Light Go - 2^2 - Stories have been read for content and enjoyment. Skills include:

1. categorizing words according to their correct short vowel sound
2. categorizing words according to their correct long vowel sound
3. identifying words and pictures with like endings
4. number of syllables in given words
5. completing sentences correctly
6. distinguishing between singular and plural forms of given words
7. homonyms
8. supplying the correct missing letter in a word
9. answering comprehension questions
10. stressing meanings of context words

City Sidewalks - 3^1 - R. _____ has been working in the book. He has worked on the following skills:

1. events in sequential order
2. drawing logical conclusions after reading short stories
3. finding specific answers to specific questions
4. completing sentences correctly
5. making the plural form of words ending in f (shelf, shelves)

6. matching rhyming words, words with opposite meanings and words with containing same root word
7. writing simple compound words

Round The Corner - 3^2 - The children have completed to page 150 in the textbook. They have worked on the following skills:

1. words with more than one meaning
2. syllables in words
3. completing sentences with correct word (ou, ow, oi, oy word forms)
4. completing sentences with words containing ew
5. review of synonyms and antonyms
6. questions on stories read

Many children have reviewed alphabetical order, and were introduced to the three parts of a dictionary first, middle, last.

As an independent activity, the children were given a list of words in which they had to write what part of the dictionary they would find the particular words. A classroom picture dictionary was used for explanation purposes.

All groups of children enjoyed the filmstrip, "A Visit to an Airport." It correlated beautifully with the story in Round The Corner, entitled GCA (Ground Control Approach) - "This Is Tiger One."

SADC-TITLE I PROGRAM EVALUATION FORMAT

FY 1972

1. Source and Amt. of Prgm. Funds:

Title I: $ 162 465.00

SADC: $_____

_____: $_____
(Specify any other)

Date Submitted June 29, 1972

Town Hartford Proj.No. 64-2, Component 29

Program Director: M. Beatrice Wood

Program Evaluator: Robert Nearine

Descriptive Title of the Program: Intensive Reading Instructional Teams

2. Period of Program:
(X) School year only
( ) Summer only
( ) School year and summer

3. Name (s) of school(s) where program took place: Clark, F. O. Jones, Vine, (Naylor, Dwight, Kennelly), Wish, Barbour

4. Report the full time equivalent (f.t.e.) number of Title I - SADC supported staff who directly taught, tutored, or counseled pupils in the program. Where a staff member directed only one-quarter of the teaching day to program teaching-learning activities, show .25 as the number for that staff member. Also indicate the total program hours of direct teaching, tutoring, or counseling rendered weekly by this staff.

f.t.e. staff number	total teaching hours weekly	f.t.e. staff number	total teaching hours weekly
(9) teacher	(14)	( ) counselor	( )
( ) tutor or aide	( )	(1½) secretary (specify other)	( )

5. Report the duration in weeks of the direct services to pupils 33 weeks

6. Report the number of public school pupils directly served 416

7. Give the grade level breakdown for public school pupils below.

Pk	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other
				247	124	45								

8. List below the criteria used to select pupils for services of the program being evaluated (economic criteria and educational criteria)

Enclosed Criteria

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR T.R.I.T.

1. Children will be recommended who are below grade level in reading achievement.

2. Children must be able to work successfully within an intensive program and adapt to the organizational set-up.

   If children are referred who cannot adjust to the situation, it will be necessary to exclude them from the program.

3. No pupil should be recommended who is now attending the E.S.L. or I.I.C. programs.

4. Experience has indicated that preference should be given to students who have a good attendance record.

5. Guidelines to be used for selection of students should include information found in the cumulative folders, teacher evaluations, and principal and reading consultant recommendations.

6. Although the teachers are requested to recommend for consideration as many children as they feel would benefit from this type of instruction, it must be clearly understood that not all of the recommended children can be accepted in this program at any one time.

March 1972

9a. If children from eligible Title I attendance areas who attended non public schools met the criteria to receive services, and received services of the town's Title I ESEA program ... indicate the number of such children and the names of the non public schools from which they came.

Not applicable

9b. Describe the specific services non public school children received.

Not applicable

9c. If the Title I services for non public school children were different from the services provided for public school children, indicate the value of such services on a separate page and attach to this report.

10a. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1971-72. 412

10b. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were not promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1971-72. 3

11a. Give the aggregate days of attendance for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 19,463

11b. Give the aggregate days of membership for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 21,10[illegible]

12a. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who withdrew from school but were not transfer withdrawals, from July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972. DNA

12b. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who remained in school from July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972.

(Subtract the number of grade 7-12 withdrawals from the total number of grade 7 through 12 public school youth served in the program which is indicated on page 1 of this report). DNA

13. Report the standardized test results secured for children in the program in Table I on the last page (page 6).

Items 13-16 are reported in the narrative.

I.R.I.T. BEHAVORIAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School J.C. Clark Cycle 2 School J.C.Clark Cycle 3 School J.C.Clark 1971-1972

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below		
1		43	2		40	5		23	12		
2		38	7	4	32	9	1	44			
3	25	18	2	13	28	4	3	40	2		
4	33	8	4	29	13	3	3	40	2		
5		41	4		42	3		43	2		
6		41		21	17	7	45				
7		39	6	20	18	7	43		2		
8		40	5	27	8	10		45			
9		44	1		41	4	41		4		

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School F. O. Jones Cycle 2 School F. O. Jones Cycle 3 School Vine 1971-1972

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average		Remarks
	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below			
1	3	36	3	2	31	10	3	31	7	2.6	32.6	4.6
2	7	25	10	2	41	0	1	39	1	3.3	35	3.6
3	6	33	3	7	33	3	9	31	1	7.3	32.3	23
4	7	29	6	12	25	6	3	32	6	7.3	28.6	6
5	4	30	8	0	41	2	0	39	2	.3	36.6	4
6	1	35	6	2	39	2	2	36	3	1.6	36.6	3.6
7	10	25	7	11	29	3	3	37	1	8	30.3	3.6
8	11	23	8	4	34	5	9	32	0	8	29.6	4.3
9	9	33	0	6	37	0	2	39	0	5.6	36.3	0

WISH IRIT READING CENTER

I.R.I.T. BEHAVORIAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School Wish Cycle 2 School Wish Cycle 3 School Barbour 1971-1972

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below		
1	4	27	14	12	26	-8	12	28	5		
2	1	32	12	8	28	2	10	31	4		
3	10	23	12	8	30	--	9	31	5		
4	15	22	8	15	18	5	11	26	8		
5	8	23	14	8	23	7	3	39	3		
6	18	15	12	16	17	5	15	26	4		
7	14	23	8	11	24	3	20	19	6		
8	12	21	12	6	24	8	13	30	2		
9	13	24	8	13	22	3	13	28	4		

June 1972

I.R.I.T. BEHAVORIAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School Naylor Cycle 2 School Konnelly Cycle 3 School Dwight 1971-1972

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below		
1	1	36	3	5	35	5	1	39	5		
2	-	40	-	-	45	-	-	44	1		
3	-	38	2	0	45	0	0	45	0		
4	4	27	9	2	38	5	2	30	13		
5	-	39	1	-	43	2	-	41	4		
6	8	29	3	5	35	5	13	27	5		
7	15	21	4	8	32	5	31	10	4		
8	38	-	2	43	-	2	[illegible]	-	1		Average number of books read was 22 books for each child
9	38	-	2	-	38	7	37	-	8		

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND EVALUATION

This evaluation report includes many kinds of data collected by the Reading Centers. Several kinds of testing programs were used with each cycle of children. The California Reading Test was used to measure the growth of each pupil.

In addition the Botel Tests - The Phonetic Inventory, Word Recognition and the Word Opposites tests were used for diagnostic purposes. Instruction was based on these findings.

There were also informal questionnaires used. Parent, teacher and pupil surveys indicated the program was indeed successful. Questionnaires in Spanish were distributed to Spanish parents.

Test results revealed that the Behavioral Objectives set up for the program were achieved.